



---

# National Institute of Justice

## S o l i c i t a t i o n

*Jeremy Travis, Director*

*August 1996*

### **Solicitation for Evaluations of Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program**



## Solicitation for Evaluations of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is soliciting proposals for evaluations of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program. It is anticipated that one award will be made for a national evaluation and up to 10 awards will be made for local evaluations of individual State programs.

This document includes:

- Information on the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program.
- Solicitation of proposals.
- Application information.
- Requirements for award recipients.

The evaluations will be conducted under cooperative agreements between the grantees and NIJ. NIJ will consult with awardees concerning study design, data collection, and other factors. Funding has been tentatively set at up to \$500,000 for the national evaluation and up to \$50,000 for each of up to 10 local evaluations of individual State programs.

### Information on the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, codified at 42 U.S.C. §3796 ff (the Act), authorizes programs to support both treatment and punishment of drug-using and violent offenders. The Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Formula Grant Program, created by Subtitle U of the Act, addresses the treatment goal by providing funding for the development of substance abuse treatment programs in State and local correctional facilities. States are encouraged to adopt comprehensive approaches to substance abuse treatment for offenders, including relapse prevention and aftercare services.

The Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program is administered by the Office of Justice Programs' Corrections Program Office (CPO), U.S. Department of Justice. In fiscal year (FY) 1996, \$27 million was appropriated for

this program. Anticipated funding for subsequent years is as follows: FY 1997, \$36 million; FY 1998, \$63 million; FY 1999, \$72 million; and FY 2000, \$72 million.

Program grant awards will be made to the State office that is designated under Section 507 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to administer the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program. Grant funds are allocated to the States using the following formula:

- Each participating State is allocated a base amount of 0.4 percent of the total funds available for the Program.
- The remaining funds are allocated to each participating State on the basis of the ratio of the prison population of such State to the total prison population of all participating States. National prisoner statistics collected by the Bureau of Justice Statistics will be used to make these allocations.

FY 1996 allocations are listed in Appendix A. FY 1996 allocations to any nonparticipating States will be added to the allocations to participating States in FY 1997.

The Federal share of a grant-funded project may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the project. Formula grant funds shall also be used to supplement, not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for activities under this program. The awards will be made for the fiscal year of the appropriation, plus 2 additional years.

The Residential Substance Abuse Treatment formula grant funds may be used to implement residential substance abuse programs that provide individual and group treatment activities for inmates in residential facilities operated by State and local correctional agencies that:

- Last between 6 and 12 months.
- Are provided in residential treatment facilities set apart from the general correctional population (set apart means a totally separate facility or a dedicated housing unit within a facility exclusively for use by program participants).

- Are directed at the substance abuse problems of the inmate.
- Are intended to develop the inmate's cognitive, behavioral, social, vocational, and other skills so as to solve the substance abuse and related problems.
- Continue to require urinalysis and/or other proven reliable forms of drug and alcohol testing of individuals assigned to treatment programs during and after release from residential custody.

States are required to give preference to subgrantee applicants who will provide aftercare services to program participants. These services must involve coordination between the correctional treatment program and other human service and rehabilitation programs. Participation in the residential program should be limited to inmates who have 6 to 12 months left in their term of confinement so they can be released from prison after completing the treatment program rather than being returned to the general prison population.

In designing and implementing the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Formula Grant Program, States are required to ensure coordination between correctional representatives and alcohol and drug abuse agencies at the State and, if appropriate, local levels. This should include coordination between activities initiated under the Program and the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant provided by the Department of Health and Human Services' Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Each participating State is required to submit an evaluation report no later than March 1 of each year. The report should include a summary of the activities carried out with formula grant funds, an assessment of the impact of such activities in meeting the goals of the Program, and the results of any program or project evaluations. The Annual Evaluation Report Summary form is included in Appendix B.

Further details about the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program can be found in the Program Guidance and Application Kit, which can be requested from the Corrections Program Office at 202-307-3914 or 800-848-6325. Applicants with questions about the Program may also call these numbers.

## Solicitation of Proposals

This section solicits two types of evaluation proposals:

- I. Local evaluations of programs in individual States.
- II. National evaluation.

### I. Local evaluations of programs in individual States

It is anticipated that up to 10 awards will be made for local evaluations of individual State programs participating in the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program. Each of these awards is expected to be funded up to \$50,000 for a period of up to 15 months. Researchers will be eligible to conduct at most one local evaluation in collaboration with the appropriate State agencies; these funds are intended to encourage multiple, nonredundant evaluations and build research capacity in this topic area.

The local evaluations should be designed to look at programs in individual States in more detail than is possible in the national evaluation or the standard State annual reports. Local evaluations may focus on all participating programs in an individual State, on some subset of programs in an individual State, or on a single program. *Local evaluation awards will be chosen to reflect a spectrum of programs, including programs for adults and juveniles (males or females), State correctional facilities and local jails, programs based on different theoretical approaches, and programs in different regions of the United States.*

Some discretion is provided in the choice of topics of these evaluations so that the evaluations will be able to address topics of importance in the individual States. Applicants must describe why the proposed topics are important and how the proposed evaluation will address them. Because programs will differ in intensity and duration, measurement of program characteristics is needed. Examples of topics that might be included in local evaluations are the number of program participants and the proportion that complete the Program, supplemental demographic and other information about participants, and in-prison performance of participants on pertinent dimensions. While NIJ understands that substantial impact evaluations are likely not possible in the 15-month time

frame of the local evaluations, evaluation designs are especially desired that:

- Will allow and prepare for subsequent impact evaluations.
- Incorporate some meaningful comparison group.
- Use valid and reliable measurement.

Participating States in which NIJ-funded local evaluations are conducted will still be required to submit standard annual reports and participate in national evaluation activities. All local evaluations must, to the extent possible, be conducted in collaboration and cooperation with the national evaluation. NIJ and a national evaluation grantee will work with local evaluation teams toward standardizing data elements across local evaluations. Data standardization will permit greater capacity for cross-State comparative analyses and ensure a more timely and useful reporting of program data to Congress.

Applications for the local evaluation awards will be accepted from researchers in academic or nonacademic settings. Applicants must describe how the evaluation will be conducted in a credible and objective manner, independent of institutions operating the programs, and must affirm that they have obtained the cooperation of participating State and local institutions by providing letters of agreement from program operators. States and researchers are encouraged to develop collaborative applications.

As described above, program grant awards will be made to the State office that is designated under Section 507 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to administer the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program. Program grant applications from States were due to the Corrections Program Office by July 1, 1996. Prospective evaluation grant applicants may obtain descriptions of the program(s) for which funding was requested from the pertinent State office. A list of the cognizant State offices is included in Appendix C.

Applicants should describe how they will conduct the evaluation, interact with participating institutions, and satisfy the requirements described in the section "Requirements for Award Recipients." Required products include a 2,500-word summary, a full technical report, automated data sets, and brief summaries for NIJ to use in

preparing annual reports to the President and Congress. Applications should indicate staffing, time lines, and milestones.

Applicants for the awards for local evaluations of individual State programs are expected to follow the proposal submission requirements described later in this solicitation. There is a limit of 15 double-spaced pages for local evaluation applications.

## II. National evaluation

It is anticipated that one award will be given to conduct a national evaluation and provide a variety of technical liaison functions, that the amount of this award will be up to \$500,000, and that the duration will be up to 24 months. The Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program is expected to run through fiscal year 2000, and NIJ intends to follow the development of the Program over this time. NIJ expects continued support for research and evaluation regarding the Program throughout this period; funding of subsequent research and evaluation phases will be awarded under new competitions and subject to the limitations of available funds.

NIJ wants to satisfy several goals through its evaluation strategy. *First, it wants to evaluate the impacts of participating State correctional residential substance abuse programs over time and across States.* Second, it wants to develop coordinated and integrated data (for analysis by the national evaluator) from the various data acquisition activities associated with the Program and its evaluation.

In the early stages of this current award, work will be mostly developmental in nature, including identifying appropriate data sources to characterize program activities, assisting the development of data collection and reporting systems, and collaborating with States and organizations involved with the Program and its evaluation. Work in later stages of the current award will be more substantive, including analyzing and synthesizing collected data and State reports, writing evaluation reports, identifying promising programs, and laying the groundwork for possible future impact evaluation.

The national evaluation consists of the following tasks:

**A) Conduct a national evaluation of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program.**

The central task of this award is to conduct a national evaluation of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program using data provided by the States, other extant information, or original data.

The evaluation should include process and outcome evaluation elements. Possible issues that might be addressed include the following:

*Administrative:* Does treatment capacity expand or contract in State facilities? Can changes in capacity be linked to this program? To what extent do States review the performance of their funded programs independently of Federal evaluation? *What are the unit costs of treatment? Are the costs bundled with correctional costs? Are treatment services delivered in a cost-effective manner?* Do States leverage program funds or simply expend the Federal resources? *What portion of associated costs are borne by this Federal program?*

*Programmatic:* *What types of programs are represented, in terms of client characteristics, program content, or theoretical approach?* How do States incorporate treatment into their institutional programs? How are clients identified with respect to management risks and need? What obstacles are encountered in delivering aftercare over large geographic areas?

*Outcome:* What are the key determinants of successful programs (as measured by abstinence, recidivism, or other indicators)? What factors explain State differences in outcome?

To participate in the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program, States and subgrantees must agree to participate in national evaluation activities. The national evaluator can anticipate substantial cooperation from States and institutions participating in the Program. *The national evaluation should include, at a minimum, a broad sample of States and programs. It will not be acceptable to include only States and programs that have, prior to participating in this Program, exemplary evaluation and data collection procedures, for such a selection approach is unlikely to result in a representative sample of programs.*

Another goal of the national evaluation strategy is to identify promising programs for intensive impact evaluations. Through the conduct of the national evaluation and the provision of technical liaison, the national evaluator will become knowledgeable about the many residential substance abuse treatment programs. The national evaluator will be expected to use this knowledge and any appropriate data and findings to identify promising programs that might be targeted for a long-term impact evaluation. Applicants should discuss how they would develop an inventory of promising programs, including potential selection criteria. In addition, the national evaluator will be asked to document one to three particularly innovative or promising programs and their apparent effects as part of NIJ's Research in Brief series.

A third goal of the national evaluation is to appraise the evaluation capability of State correctional residential substance abuse programs and, where possible, enhance such evaluation capabilities through feedback and technical assistance coordination. States participating in the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program will vary considerably in their capability to evaluate subgrantee programs. Some States or programs may proactively request evaluation guidance or technical assistance, while others may have unrecognized needs. The national evaluation grantee will be expected to (1) assess participating State's evaluation capabilities and identify inadequacies and areas needing improvement; (2) make recommendations for addressing these weaknesses and enhancing evaluation capabilities; and (3) provide guidance and support to CPO's technical assistance contractor as it provides evaluation technical assistance to States and programs. These tasks will require close collaboration between the national evaluator and CPO's technical assistance contractor.

Applicants should describe how they will conduct the national evaluation, interact with participating States and institutions, and provide the required products. Required products include a 2,500-word summary, a full technical report, automated data sets, and brief summaries for NIJ to use in preparing annual reports to the President and Congress. Applications should indicate staffing, budget, time lines, and milestones. Applicants should also describe how they expect to interact with CPO and its technical assistance contractor.

## B) Provide technical liaison to States and research organizations to enhance the utility of annual reports and data.

There will be three sources of data associated with the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program. First, each participating State is required to submit an annual report no later than March 1 of each year, including the Annual Evaluation Report Summary (Appendix B). Second, the local evaluations of programs (described above) will provide data specific to targeted programs. Third, the national evaluation may collect a variety of data. In light of the expected variability of programs and data, special efforts will be required to ensure maximum utility and cross-site comparability of data. The national evaluation grantee will be expected to work cooperatively with CPO and its technical assistance contractor, State agencies involved in delivering treatment, and research organizations involved in local evaluation grants to enhance the comparability and utility of data and associated reports. The national evaluator will also be expected to suggest data elements common to the various evaluative efforts of the Program. Applicants should propose a plan for achieving the above goals.

Applicants for the national evaluation award are expected to follow the proposal submission requirements described below. *There is a limit of 30 double-spaced pages for national evaluation applications.*

## Application Information

**Award period and amount.** It is anticipated that one award will be made for conducting the national evaluation, with an award period of up to 24 months, and up to 10 awards will be made for independent evaluations of programs in individual States, with award periods of up to 15 months. Funding has been tentatively set at up to \$500,000 for the national evaluation and technical support award and up to \$50,000 for each of up to 10 independent evaluations of individual State programs.

**Due date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Evaluations of the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20531

Completed proposals **must be received** at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on **September 4, 1996**. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** To obtain further information, prospective applicants may contact James Trudeau at 202-307-1355.

## Other Requirements and Recommendations

In this section applicants will find recommendations to grant writers, requirements for award recipients, and general application information.

Also included in this section are general application and eligibility requirements and selection criteria. Proposals not conforming to the application procedures will not be considered.

## Recommendations to Grant Writers

Over the past 4 years, Institute staff have reviewed approximately 1,500 grant applications. On the basis of those reviews and inquiries from applicants, the Institute offers the following recommendations to help potential applicants present workable, understandable proposals. Many of these recommendations were adopted from materials provided to NIJ by the State Justice Institute, especially for applicants new to NIJ. Others reflect standard NIJ requirements.

The author(s) of the proposal should be clearly identified.

Proposals that are incorrectly collated, incomplete, or handwritten will be judged as submitted or, at NIJ's discretion, will be returned without a deadline extension. No additions to the original submission are allowed. The Institute suggests that applicants make certain that they address the questions and issues set forth below when preparing an application.

**1. What is the subject or problem you wish to address?** Discuss how your approach will improve the situation or advance state-of-the-art knowledge, and explain why it is the most appropriate approach to take. The source of statistics or research findings cited to support a statement or position should be included in a reference list.

**2. What do you want to do?** Explain the goal(s) of the project in simple, straightforward terms. The goal(s) should describe the intended consequences or expected overall effect of the proposed project rather than the tasks

or activities to be conducted. To the greatest extent possible, applicants should avoid a specialized vocabulary that is not readily understood by the general public. Technical jargon does not enhance an application.

**3. How will you do it?** Describe the methodology carefully so that what you propose to do and how you would do it is clear. All proposed tasks should be set forth so that a reviewer can see a logical progression of tasks and relate those tasks directly to the accomplishment of the project's goal(s). When in doubt about whether to provide a more detailed explanation or to assume a particular level of knowledge or expertise on the part of the reviewers, err on the side of caution and provide the additional information. A description of project tasks will also help identify necessary budget items. All staff positions and project costs should relate directly to the tasks described. The Institute encourages applicants to attach letters of cooperation and support from agencies that will be involved in or directly affected by the proposed project.

**4. How will others learn about your findings?** Include a plan to disseminate the results of the research or evaluation beyond the jurisdictions and individuals directly affected by the project. The plan should identify the specific methods that will be used to inform the respective field about the project, such as the publication of journal articles or the distribution of key materials. Expectations regarding products are discussed more fully in the next section, "Requirements for Award Recipients." A statement that a report or research findings "will be made available to" the field is not sufficient. The specific means of distribution or dissemination as well as the types of recipients should be identified. Reproduction and dissemination costs are allowable budget items. Applicants must concisely describe the interim and final products and address each product's purpose, audience, and usefulness to the field. This discussion should identify the principal criminal justice constituency or type of agency for which each product is intended and describe how the constituent group or agency would be expected to use the product or report. Successful proposals will clearly identify the nature of the grant products that can reasonably be expected if the project is funded. In addition, a schedule of delivery dates of all products should be delineated.

**5. What are the specific costs involved?** The budget application should be presented clearly. Major budget categories such as personnel, benefits, travel, supplies,

equipment, and indirect costs should be identified separately. The components of "other" or "miscellaneous" items should be specified in the application budget narrative and should not include set-asides for undefined contingencies.

**6. How much detail should be included in the budget narrative?** The budget narrative should list all planned expenditures and detail the salaries, materials, and cost assumptions used to estimate project costs. The narrative and cost estimates should be presented under the following standard budget categories: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other, and indirect costs. Applicants must include the full amount of NIJ funding for the entire life of the project. This amount should be reflected in item 15g on Standard Form (SF) 424 and in "Total Project Costs," the last page of the Budget Detail Worksheet (OJP form 7150/1). When appropriate, grant applications should include justification of consultants and a full explanation of daily rates for any consultants proposed. To avoid common shortcomings of application budget narratives, include the following information:

- Personnel estimates that accurately provide the amount of time to be spent by personnel involved with the project and the total associated costs, including current salaries for the designated personnel (e.g., project director, 50 percent of 1 year's annual salary of \$50,000 = \$25,000). If salary costs are computed using an hourly or daily rate, the annual salary and number of hours or days in a workyear should be shown.
- Estimates for supplies and expenses supported by a complete description of the supplies to be used, nature and extent of printing to be done, anticipated telephone charges, and other common expenditures, with the basis for computing the estimates included (e.g., 100 reports x 75 pages each x \$0.05/page = \$375). Supply and expense estimates offered simply as "based on experience" are not sufficient.

**7. What travel regulations apply to the budget estimates?** Transportation costs and per diem rates must comply with the policies of the applicant organization, and a copy of the applicant's travel policy should be submitted as an appendix to the application. If the applicant does not have a travel policy established in writing, then travel rates must be consistent with those established by the



Federal Government. The budget narrative should state which regulations are in force for the project and should include the estimated fare, the number of persons traveling, the number of trips to be taken, and the length of stay. The estimated costs of travel, lodging, ground transportation, and other subsistence should be listed separately. When combined, the subtotals for these categories should equal the estimate listed on the budget form.

**8. Which forms should be used?** A copy of SF 424, Application for Federal Assistance, plus instructions, appears in the back of this solicitation. Please follow the instructions carefully and include all parts and pages. In addition to SF 424, recent requirements involve certification regarding (1) lobbying; (2) debarment, suspension, and other responsibility matters; and (3) drug-free workplace requirements. The certification form that is attached to SF 424 should be signed by the appropriate official and included in the grant application.

**9. What technical materials should be included in the application?**

- A one-page abstract of the full proposal, highlighting the project's purpose, methods, and activities.
- A program narrative, which is the technical portion of the proposal. It should include a clear, concise statement of the problem, goal(s), and objectives of the project, and related questions to be explored. A discussion of the relationship of the proposed work to the existing literature is expected.
- A statement of the project's anticipated contribution to criminal justice policy and practice. It is important that applicants briefly cite those particular issues and concerns of present-day criminal justice policy that stimulate the proposed line of inquiry and suggest what their own investigation would contribute to current knowledge.
- A detailed statement of the proposed research or study design and analytical methodologies. The proposed data sources, data collection strategies, variables and issues to be examined, and procedures of analysis to be employed should be delineated carefully and completely. When appropriate, experimental designs are encouraged because of their potential relevance to policymaking and the strength of the evidence they can produce.
- The organization and management plan to conduct the study. A list of major milestones of events, activities, and

products and a time table for completion that indicates the time commitments to individual project tasks should be included. All grant activities, including writing of the final report, should be completed within the duration of the award period.

- The applicant's curriculum vitae should summarize education, research experience, and bibliographic information related to the proposed work.

**10. Use of grant funds.** Grant funds may be used to purchase or lease equipment essential to accomplishing the objectives of the project. The budget narrative must list such equipment and explain why the equipment is necessary. Funds may not be used for operating programs, writing texts or handbooks, training, etc.

**11. To what extent may indirect costs be included in the budget estimates?** It is the policy of the Institute that all costs should be budgeted directly; however, if an applicant has an indirect cost rate that has been approved by a Federal agency within the past 2 years, an indirect cost-recovery estimate may be included in the budget. A copy of the approved rate agreement should be submitted as an appendix to the application. If an applicant does not have an approved rate agreement, the applicant should contact the Office of the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs, 202-307-0623, to obtain information about preparing an indirect cost-rate proposal.

The institutional affiliations of investigators are encouraged to waive or reduce indirect and overhead fees. These fees will be limited to no more than 20 percent of the total amount of the award.

**12. What, if any, matching funds are required?**

Units of State and local governments (not including publicly supported institutions of higher education) are encouraged to contribute a match (cash, noncash, or both) of requested funds. Other applicants also are encouraged to seek matching contributions from other Federal agencies or private foundations to assist in meeting the costs of the project.

**13. Should other funding sources be listed?** Applicants are expected to identify all other Federal, local, or private sources of support, including other NIJ programs, to which this or a closely related proposal has been or will be submitted. This information permits NIJ to consider the joint funding potential and limits the possibility of inad-

vertent duplicate funding. Applicants may submit more than one proposal to NIJ, but the same proposal cannot be submitted in more than one program area.

**14. What is the deadline? September 4, 1996.**

**15. Is there a page limit?** The Institute has established a limit of 30 double-spaced pages for national evaluation applications and a limit of 15 double-spaced pages for local evaluation applications. This page limit does not include references, budget narrative, curriculum vitae, or necessary appendixes. NIJ does not wish to create elaborate regulations regarding type fonts, margins, and spacing. Applicants are cautioned, however, that obvious attempts to stretch interpretations of the Institute's limits have, in the past, caused proposal reviewers to regard such efforts unfavorably.

**16. What is the page order?** The following order is mandatory. Omission can result in rejection of the application:

1. SF 424.
2. Names and affiliations of all key persons, including applicant and subcontractor(s), advisers, consultants, and advisory board members.
3. Abstract.
4. Table of contents.
5. Budget narrative.
6. Assurances and certifications, etc.
7. Negotiated rate agreement.
8. Program narrative.
9. References.
10. Resumes of key personnel.

**17. What does the review process entail?** After all applications for a competition are received, NIJ will convene a review panel. Panel members read each proposal and meet to assess the technical merits and policy relevance of the proposed research. Panel assessments of the proposals are submitted to the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who has sole and final authority over approval and awards. The review normally takes 60 to 90

days, depending on the number of applications received. Each applicant receives written comments from the peer review panel concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. These comments may include suggestions for how a revised or subsequent application to NIJ might be improved.

**18. What are the criteria for an award?** The essential question asked of each applicant is, "If this study is successful, how will criminal justice policies or operations be improved?" Four criteria are applied in the evaluation process:

- Impact of the proposed project.
- Feasibility of the approach to the issue, including technical merit and practical considerations.
- Originality of the approach, including creativity of the proposal and capability of the research staff.
- Economy of the approach.

Applicants bear the responsibility of demonstrating to the panel that the proposed study addresses the critical issues of the topic area and that the study findings could ultimately contribute to a practical application in criminal justice. Reviewers will assess applicants' awareness of related research or studies and their ability to direct the research or study toward answering questions of policy or improving the state of criminal justice operations.

Technical merit is judged by the likelihood that the study design will produce convincing findings. Reviewers take into account the logic and timing of the research or study plan, the validity and reliability of measures proposed, the appropriateness of statistical methods to be used, and each applicant's awareness of factors that might dilute the credibility of the findings. Impact is judged by the scope of the proposed approach and by the utility of the proposed products. Reviewers consider each applicant's understanding of the process of innovation in the targeted criminal justice agency or setting and knowledge of prior uses of criminal justice research by the proposed criminal justice constituency. Appropriateness of the products' proposed content and format is also considered.

Applicants' qualifications are evaluated both in terms of the depth of experience and the relevance of that experience to the proposed research or study. Costs are evaluated on the basis of reasonableness of each item and the

utility of the project to the Institute's program.

**19. Are there any other considerations in selecting applications for an award?** Projects should have a national or regional impact or have potential relevance to a number of jurisdictions. Because of the broad national mandate of the National Institute of Justice, projects that address the unique concerns of a single jurisdiction should be fully justified.

The applicant's performance on previous or current NIJ grants will also be taken into consideration in making funding decisions.

**20. Who is eligible to apply?** NIJ awards grants to, or enters into cooperative agreements with, educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profit-making organizations that are willing to waive their fees. Where appropriate, special eligibility criteria are indicated in the separate solicitations.

**21. Does NIJ accept resubmission of proposals?**

The Institute will accept resubmission of a previously submitted proposal. The applicant should indicate for Question 8, SF 424, that the application is a revision. The applicant should include this information in the abstract. Finally, the applicant should prepare a one-page response to the earlier panel review (to follow the abstract), including (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal, and (2) a brief summary of responses to the review and/or revisions to the proposal.

## Requirements for Award Recipients

### Required Products

Each project is expected to generate tangible products of maximum benefit to criminal justice professionals, researchers, and policymakers. In particular, NIJ strongly encourages documents that provide information of practical utility to law enforcement officials; prosecutors; judges; corrections officers; victim service providers; and Federal, State, county, and local elected officials.

Products should include:

- A summary of approximately 2,500 words highlighting the research findings and the policy issues those findings will inform. The material should be written in a style that will be accessible to policy officials and practitioners and

suitable for possible publication as an NIJ Research in Brief. An NIJ editorial style guide is sent to each project director at the time of the award.

- A full technical report, including a discussion of the research question, review of the literature, description of project methodology, detailed review of project findings, and conclusions and policy recommendations.
- Clean copies of all automated data sets developed during the research and full documentation prepared in accordance with the instructions in the NIJ data resources manual.
- Brief project summaries for NIJ to use in preparing annual reports to the President and Congress.

As appropriate, additional products such as case studies and interim and final reports (e.g., articles, manuals, or training materials) may be specified in the proposal or negotiated at the time of the award.

### Public Release of Automated Data Sets

NIJ is committed to ensuring the public availability of research data and to this end established its Data Resources Program in 1984. All NIJ award recipients who collect data are required to submit a machine-readable copy of the data and appropriate documentation to NIJ prior to the conclusion of the project. The data and materials are reviewed for completeness. NIJ staff then create machine-readable data sets, prepare user's guides, and distribute data and documentation to other researchers in the field. A variety of formats are acceptable; however, the data and materials must conform with requirements detailed in *Depositing Data With the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice: A Handbook*. A copy of this handbook is sent to each project director at the time of the award. For further information about NIJ's Data Resources Program, contact Dr. James Trudeau at 202-307-1355.

### Standards of Performance by Recipients

NIJ expects individuals and institutions receiving its support to work diligently and professionally toward completing a high-quality research or study product. Besides this general expectation, the Institute imposes specific requirements to ensure that proper financial and administrative controls are applied to the project. Financial and general reporting requirements are detailed in *Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants*, a publication of the Office of Justice Programs. This manual is sent to recipient

institutions along with other award documents. Project directors and recipient financial administrators should pay particular attention to the regulations in this document.

### Program Monitoring

Award recipients and Principal Investigators assume certain responsibilities as part of their participation in government-sponsored research and evaluation. NIJ's monitoring activities are intended to help grantees meet these responsibilities. They are based on good communication and open dialog, with collegiality and mutual respect. Some of the elements of this dialog follow:

- Communication with NIJ in the early stages of the grant, as the elements of the proposal's design and methodology are developed and operationalized.
- Timely communication with NIJ regarding any developments that might affect the project's compliance with schedules, milestones, and products set forth in the proposal. (See statement on "Timeliness" below.)
- Communication with other NIJ grantees conducting related research projects. An annual "cluster conference" should be anticipated and budgeted for by applicants at a cost of \$1,000 for each year of the grant.
- Consideration of communication with the field through electronic media to make available interim reports and data sets, and other grant products as appropriate.
- Providing NIJ, on request, with brief descriptions of the project in interim stages at such time as the Institute may need this information to meet its reporting requirements to Congress. NIJ will give as much advance notification of these requests as possible but will expect a timely response from grantees when requests are made.
- Providing NIJ with copies of presentations made at conferences, meetings, and elsewhere based in whole or in part on the work of the project.
- Providing NIJ with prepublication copies of articles based on the project appearing in professional journals or the media, either during the life of the grant or after.
- Other reporting requirements (progress reports, final reports, and other grant products) are spelled out elsewhere in this solicitation. Financial reporting requirements will be described in the grant award documents received by successful applicants.

### Communications

NIJ Program Managers should be kept informed of research progress. Written progress reports are required on a semiannual basis and should inform the Program Manager which tasks have been completed and whether significant delays or departures from the original workplan are expected. The first progress report should cover the period from the project start-up date through the end of the first *complete* quarter (quarters are January 1–March 31, April 1–June 30, July 1–September 30, and October 1–December 31). Subsequent progress reports should cover the next two quarters. All progress reports are due 30 days following the end of the reporting period. For example, if a grant is awarded in May, the first progress report would cover the rest of the current quarter (through June 30) and the first complete quarter (July 1–September 30), and would be due October 31; the second progress report would cover the next two quarters (October 1–December 31 and January 1–March 31) and would be due April 30.

### Timeliness

Grant recipients are expected to complete award products within the time frames that have been agreed upon by NIJ and the grantee.

### Publications

The Institute encourages grant recipients to prepare their work for NIJ publication. In cases where grantees disseminate their findings through a variety of media, such as professional journals, books, and conferences, copies of such publications should be sent to the Program Manager as they become available, even if they appear well after a project's expiration. NIJ imposes no restriction on such publications other than the following acknowledgment and disclaimer:

*This research was supported by grant number \_\_\_\_\_ from the National Institute of Justice. Points of view are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the position of the U.S. Department of Justice.*

### Data Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection

Research that examines individual traits and experiences plays a vital part in expanding our knowledge about crime

control and criminal behavior. It is essential, however, that researchers protect subjects from needless risk of harm or embarrassment and proceed with willing and informed cooperation. NIJ requires that investigators protect information identifiable to research participants. When information is safeguarded, it is protected by statute from being used in legal proceedings:

[S]uch information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings [42 U.S.C. 3789g(a)].

Applicants should file their plans to protect sensitive information as part of their proposal. Necessary safeguards are detailed in 28 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 22. A short “how-to” guideline for developing a privacy and confidentiality plan can be obtained from NIJ Program Managers.

In addition, the Department of Justice has adopted human subjects policies similar to those established by the Department of Health and Human Services. In general, these policies exempt researchers from Institutional Review Board (IRB) review provided that necessary safeguards of privacy and confidentiality have been met. However, the Institute may find in certain instances that subjects or subject matters are especially sensitive and may require IRB review. These exceptions will be decided on an individual basis during application review. Applicants should read 28 CFR, Part 46, to determine their individual project requirements.

## Appendix A

### Estimated Formula Grant Allocations

<u>State</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Alabama	\$485,214	New Jersey	\$591,736
Alaska	133,887	New Mexico	178,541
Arizona	501,066	New York	1,416,014
Arkansas	268,923	North Carolina	614,639
California	2,622,956	North Dakota	111,080
Colorado	306,044	Ohio	928,595
Connecticut	303,393	Oklahoma	437,621
Delaware	155,100	Oregon	243,561
District of Columbia	284,967	Pennsylvania	672,781
Florida	1,290,470	Rhode Island	135,559
Georgia	754,766	South Carolina	473,667
Hawaii	149,201	South Dakota	133,561
Idaho	161,613	Tennessee	386,282
Illinois	825,455	Texas	2,541,297
Indiana	401,000	Utah	162,228
Iowa	208,726	Vermont	114,481
Kansas	232,455	Virginia	624,093
Kentucky	328,947	Washington	318,437
Louisiana	576,634	West Virginia	146,204
Maine	127,393	Wisconsin	303,643
Maryland	511,326	Wyoming	124,492
Massachusetts	319,725	<u>Territory</u>	
Michigan	894,375	American Samoa	100,186
Minnesota	190,895	Guam	105,412
Mississippi	338,497	Northern Mariana Islands	100,590
Missouri	463,272	Puerto Rico	265,753
Montana	133,964	Virgin Islands	103,856
Nebraska	153,178		
Nevada	243,215		
New Hampshire	139,037		

#### Notes:

- The allocations are based on a formula that provides each State with a base amount, plus an allocation in proportion to the ratio that its State prison population bears to the total State prison population for all participating States. The State prison population includes all inmates under the jurisdiction of the State for whom the State has legal authority and responsibility to enforce their prison sentence, including inmates who may be housed in other States, county/city jails, halfway houses, Federal facilities, etc.
- State prisoner counts for the States are as of June 30, 1995, as reported to the Bureau of Justice Statistics in the National Prisoners Statistics (NPS-1A).
- For States with an integrated prison and jail system, prisoner counts include only those inmates with sentences greater than 1 year.
- Prisoner counts for the Territories are as of December 31, 1995, as reported to the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Counts include only those inmates with sentences greater than 1 year.

## Appendix B

### Annual Evaluation Report Summary

The State Office is required to submit an evaluation report by March 1 of each year. This form should be completed for each grant-funded project and should be included as part of the annual evaluation report.

**Project Title:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Location (City and State):** \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Requested Information</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>From Start of Project</u>
1. Number of residential substance abuse treatment beds that were developed with grant funds	_____	_____
2. Number of offenders admitted to the grant-supported treatment programs:		
– Total	_____	_____
– Males	_____	_____
– Females	_____	_____
– Adults	_____	_____
– Juveniles	_____	_____
– White	_____	_____
– Black	_____	_____
– Hispanic	_____	_____
– Native American	_____	_____
– Other	_____	_____
3. Average length of stay in:		
– the residential program	_____	_____
– aftercare	_____	_____
4. Number of offenders successfully completing the grant-supported treatment program	_____	_____
5. Number of offenders who:		
– dropped out of the program	_____	_____
– were terminated from the program	_____	_____
6. Number of offenders who successfully completed the aftercare program	_____	_____
7. Of the offenders who completed the program, the percent that have remained drug-free during:		
– the residential program	_____	_____
– aftercare	_____	_____
8. Of the offenders who completed the program, the percent that have remained arrest-free during:		
– the residential program	_____	_____
– aftercare	_____	_____
– following release from aftercare (at least 1 year followup)	_____	_____
9. Of the offenders who completed the program, the percent that have remained conviction-free during:		
– the residential program	_____	_____
– aftercare	_____	_____
– following release from aftercare (at least 1 year followup)	_____	_____
10. Average cost of the residential program, and the aftercare component per offender who completed the program	_____	_____

## Appendix C

### State Offices Administering the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Formula Grant Program

**Alabama**

Douglas Miller  
Section Chief  
Law Enforcement/Traffic Safety  
Division  
Department of Economic and  
Community Affairs  
401 Adams Avenue, P.O. Box 5690  
Montgomery, Alabama 36103-5690  
**Contact: Douglas Miller**  
Phone: 334-242-5891  
Fax: 334-242-0712

**Alaska**

Colonel Glenn Godfrey  
Director  
Alaska State Troopers  
5700 East Tudor Road  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507  
**Contact: Catherine Katsel**  
Phone: 907-269-5082  
Fax: 907-337-2059

**Arizona**

Rex M. Holgerson  
Executive Director  
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission  
1501 West Washington Street, Suite 207  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
**Contact: Joseph R. Farmer**  
Phone: 602-542-1928  
Fax: 602-542-4852

**Arkansas**

Jerry Duran  
Administrator  
Office of Intergovernmental Services  
Department of Finance and  
Administration  
1515 Building, Suite 417  
P.O. Box 3278  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

**Contact: Gordon Burton**

Phone: 501-682-1074  
Fax: 501-682-5206

**California**

Ray Johnson  
Executive Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Planning  
1130 K Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, California 95814  
**Contact: Glenn E. Johnson**  
Phone: 916-324-9166  
Fax: 916-327-8714

**Colorado**

Bill Woodward  
Director  
Division of Criminal Justice  
700 Kipling Street, 3rd Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80215  
**Contact: John Inmann**  
Phone: 303-239-4442  
Fax: 303-239-4491

**Connecticut**

Leonard F. D'Amico  
Under Secretary  
Office of Policy and Management  
450 Capitol Avenue, MS #52CPD  
P.O. Box 341441  
Hartford, Connecticut 06134-1441  
**Contact: Jack Bates**  
Phone: 860-418-6210  
Fax: 860-418-6496

**Delaware**

James Kane  
Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Council  
Carvel State Office Building  
820 North French Street, 4th Floor  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

**Contact: Tricia Peraino**

Phone: 302-577-3466  
Fax: 302-577-3440

**District of Columbia**

Robert L. Lester  
Acting Executive Director  
Office of Grants Management and De-  
velopment  
717 14th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
**Contact: Tanya Hatton**  
Phone: 202-727-6554  
Fax: 202-727-1617

**Florida**

Rosa M. Morgan  
Chief  
Bureau of Community Assistance  
The Rhyne Building  
2740 Centerview Drive  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100  
**Contact: Clayton Wilder**  
Phone: 904-488-8016  
Fax: 904-487-4414

**Georgia**

Martha Gilland  
Director  
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council  
503 Oak Place, Suite 540  
Atlanta, Georgia 30349  
**Contact: John T. Clower**  
Phone: 404-559-4949  
Fax: 404-559-4960

**Hawaii**

The Honorable Margery S. Bronster  
Attorney General  
State of Hawaii  
425 Queen Street, Room 221  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813



**Contact: Lari Koga**

Phone: 808-586-1151

Fax: 808-586-1373

**Idaho**

Robert L. Sobba

Director

Idaho Department of Law Enforcement

P.O. Box 700

Meridian, Idaho 83680-0700

**Contact: Roberta Silva**

Phone: 208-884-7040

Fax: 208-884-7094

**Illinois**

Thomas F. Baker

Executive Director

Illinois Criminal Justice Information  
Authority120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016  
Chicago, Illinois 60606**Contact: Candice M. Kane**

Phone: 312-793-8550

Fax: 312-793-8422

**Indiana**

Catherine O'Connor

Executive Director

Indiana Criminal Justice Institute  
302 West Washington Street, Room E-209  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**Contact: Doug Fowler**

Phone: 317-232-2561

Fax: 317-232-4979

**Iowa**

Charles W. Larson

Coordinator

Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse  
Lucas State Office Building, 2nd Floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**Contact: Dale R. Woolery**

Phone: 515-281-3788

Fax: 515-242-6390

**Kansas**

Barbara Tombs

Executive Director

Kansas Criminal Justice Coordinating  
Council

700 S.W. Jackson, Room 501

Topeka, Kansas 66603

**Contact: Ronald McVeigh**

Phone: 913-296-0926

Fax: 913-296-0927

**Kentucky**

Gary Bruner

Assistant Director

Division of Grants Management  
Justice Cabinet

Bush Building

403 Wapping Street, 2nd Floor

Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

**Contact: Debra McGovern**

Phone: 502-564-7554

Fax: 502-564-4840

**Louisiana**

Michael Ranatza

Executive Director

Louisiana Commission on Law  
Enforcement

1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Suite 708

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

**Contact: Debbie Maggio**

Phone: 504-925-3513

Fax: 504-925-1998

**Maine**

Alfred Skolfield, Jr.

Commissioner

Department of Public Safety

State House Station 42

Augusta, Maine 04333

**Contact: David Giampetruzzi**

Maine Justice Assistance Council

93 Silver Street

Waterville, Maine 04901

Phone: 207-877-8016

Fax: 207-877-8027

**Maryland**

Terry Walsh Roberts

Executive Director

Governor's Office of Crime Control  
and Prevention

300 East Joppa Road, Suite 1105

Baltimore, Maryland 21286-3016

**Contact: Greg Leyko**

Phone: 410-321-3521

Fax: 410-321-3116

**Massachusetts**

Jonathan M. Petuchowski

Executive Director

Massachusetts Committee on Criminal  
Justice

100 Cambridge Street, Room 2100

Boston, Massachusetts 02202

**Contact: Susan Foster**

Phone: 617-727-6300

Fax: 617-727-5356

**Michigan**

Thomas Ginster

Interim Director

Office of Drug Control Policy

Michigan National Tower

124 West Allegan, Suite 1200

Lansing, Michigan 48913

**Contact: Ardith DaFoe**

Phone: 517-373-2952

Fax: 517-373-2963

**Minnesota**

Mary Ellison

Assistant Commissioner

Office of Drug Policy and Violence  
Prevention

Department of Public Safety

444 Cedar Street, Suite 100-D

Town Square

St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2156

**Contact: Jeri Boisvert**

Phone: 612-296-0922

Fax: 612-297-7313 (ODP)

**Mississippi**

Donald O'Cain  
Executive Director  
Division of Public Safety Planning  
Department of Public Safety  
401 North West Street, 8th Floor  
P.O. Box 23039  
Jackson, Mississippi 39225-3039  
**Contact: Herbert Terry**  
Phone: 601-359-7880  
Fax: 601-359-7832

**Missouri**

Gary B. Kempker  
Director  
Missouri Department of Public Safety  
Truman State Office Building  
Room 870, P.O. Box 749  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0749  
**Contact: Kenneth Higgins**  
Phone: 573-751-4905  
Fax: 573-751-5399

**Montana**

Gene Kiser  
Executive Director  
Montana Board of Crime Control  
303 North Roberts  
Scott Hart Building  
Helena, Montana 59620  
**Contact: Cathy Kendall**  
Phone: 406-444-3604  
Fax: 406-444-4722

**Nebraska**

Allen L. Curtis  
Executive Director  
Nebraska Commission on Law  
Enforcement & Criminal Justice  
301 Centennial Mall South  
P.O. Box 94946  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509  
**Contact: Nancy Steeves**  
Phone: 402-471-3416  
Fax: 402-471-2837

**Nevada**

James P. Weller  
Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Assistance  
555 Wright Way  
Carson City, Nevada 89711-0900  
**Contact: Mary Lynne Evans**  
Office of Narcotics Control Assistance  
Phone: 702-687-5282  
Fax: 702-687-5328

**New Hampshire**

Mark C. Thompson  
Director of Administration  
Office of the Attorney General  
33 Capitol Street  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
**Contact: Paul Doran**  
Phone: 603-271-1297  
Fax: 603-271-2110

**New Jersey**

Terrence P. Farley  
Director  
Division of Criminal Justice  
Department of Law and Public Safety  
25 Market Street  
CN 085  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0085  
**Contact: Dennis O'Hara**  
Phone: 609-292-5939  
Fax: 609-292-1451

**New Mexico**

Darren P. White  
Cabinet Secretary  
Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 1628  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504  
**Contact: Donna Farrell**  
Phone: 505-827-9099  
Fax: 505-827-3398

**New York**

Paul Shechtman  
Commissioner  
New York State Division of Criminal  
Justice Services  
Executive Park Tower  
Stuyvesant Plaza  
Albany, New York 12203-3764  
**Contact: Gary Schreivogl**  
Phone: 518-457-8462  
Fax: 518-457-1186

**North Carolina**

David E. Jones  
Acting Director  
Governor's Crime Commission  
3824 Barrett Drive, Suite 100  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609  
**Contact: Mark Jones**  
Phone: 919-571-4736  
Fax: 919-571-4745

**North Dakota**

William Broer, Jr.  
Director  
Bureau of Criminal Investigation  
Attorney General's Office  
P.O. Box 1054  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58502  
**Contact: Tammy Becker**  
Phone: 701-328-5500  
Fax: 701-328-5510

**Ohio**

Michael Lee  
Director  
Governor's Office of Criminal Justice  
Services  
400 East Town Street, Suite 120  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
**Contact: Karen Days**  
Phone: 614-466-7782  
Fax: 614-466-0308

**Oklahoma**

Bruce Walker  
Executive Coordinator  
District Attorneys Training &  
Coordination Council  
2200 Classen Boulevard, Suite 1800  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106-5811  
**Contact: Gayle Caldwell**  
Phone: 405-557-6707  
Fax: 405-524-0581

**Oregon**

Greg Peden  
Director  
Oregon Department of State Police  
Criminal Justice Services Division  
400 Public Service Building  
Salem, Oregon 97310  
**Contact: Beverlee Venell**  
Phone: 503-378-3720  
Fax: 503-378-8666

**Pennsylvania**

James Thomas  
Executive Director  
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime  
and Delinquency  
P.O. Box 1167, Federal Square Station  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108-1167  
**Contact: Bob Donovan**  
Phone: 717-787-2040, ext. 8559  
Fax: 717-783-7713

**Puerto Rico**

The Honorable Pedro R. Pierluisi  
Attorney General  
Department of Justice  
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico  
P.O. Box 192  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902  
**Contact: Lizzette Traverso Santiago**  
Phone: 809-725-0335  
Fax: 809-725-6144

**Rhode Island**

Joseph E. Smith  
Executive Director  
Governor's Justice Commission  
One Capitol Hill, 4th Floor  
Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5803  
**Contact: David LeDoux**  
Phone: 401-277-2620  
Fax: 401-277-1294

**South Carolina**

George Hendry  
Administrator  
Office of Safety and Grants  
Department of Public Safety  
5400 Broad River Road  
Columbia, South Carolina 29210-4088  
**Contact: Lisa A. Nine**  
Phone: 803-896-8708  
Fax: 803-896-8714

**South Dakota**

James D. Hagen  
Chief of Staff  
Governor's Office of Operations  
State Capitol Building  
500 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070  
**Contact: Wanda L. Fergen**  
Phone: 605-773-6313  
Fax: 605-773-6471

**Tennessee**

Marsha Willis  
Director  
Office of Criminal Justice Programs  
Department of Finance and Adminis-  
tration  
1400 Andrew Jackson Building  
500 Deaderick Street  
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1700  
**Contact: Marsha Willis**  
Phone: 615-741-3784  
Fax: 615-532-2989

**Texas**

Karen J. Greene  
Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Division  
Office of the Governor  
P.O. Box 12428, Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711  
**Contact: Robert J. Bodisch, Sr.**  
Phone: 512-463-1806  
Fax: 512-475-2440

**Utah**

S. Camille Anthony  
Executive Director  
Commission on Criminal and Juvenile  
Justice  
State Capitol Building, Room 101  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114  
**Contact: Laura Lewis**  
Phone: 801-538-1031  
Fax: 801-538-1024

**Vermont**

James Walton, Jr.  
Commissioner  
Vermont Department of Public Safety  
Waterbury State Complex  
103 South Main Street  
Waterbury, Vermont 05676-0850  
**Contact: Capt. Donald Ravenna**  
Phone: 802-244-8781  
Fax: 802-244-1106

**Virginia**

Bruce C. Morris  
Director  
Department of Criminal Justice Services  
805 East Broad Street, 10th Floor  
**Contact: Joe Marshall**  
Phone: 804-786-1577  
Fax: 804-371-8981

**Virgin Islands**

Ramon S. Davila  
 Police Commissioner/Drug Policy  
 Advisor  
 Virgin Islands Law Enforcement  
 Planning Commission  
 116 & 164 Submarine Base  
 Estate Nisky #6 Southside Quarters  
 St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802  
**Contact: Helene Smollett**  
 Phone: 809-774-6400  
 Fax: 809-776-3317

**Washington**

Mike Fitzgerald  
 Director  
 Washington State Department of  
 Community, Trade  
 & Economic Development  
 906 Columbia Street, S.W.  
 P.O. Box 48300  
 Olympia, Washington 98504  
**Contact: Kay Boyd**  
 Phone: 360-586-0665  
 Fax: 360-586-0489

**West Virginia**

James M. Albert  
 Director  
 Office of Criminal Justice & Highway  
 Safety  
 Department of Military Affairs &  
 Public Safety  
 1204 Kanawha Boulevard, East  
 Charleston, West Virginia 25301  
**Contact: Melissa Whittington**  
 Phone: 304-558-8814  
 Fax: 304-558-0391

**Wisconsin**

Fred Falk  
 Executive Director  
 Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance  
 222 State Street, 2nd Floor  
 Madison, Wisconsin 53702  
**Contact: Raymond J. Luick**  
 Phone: 608-266-7282  
 Fax: 608-266-6676

**Wyoming**

Thomas J. Pagel  
 Director  
 Division of Criminal Investigation  
 316 West 22nd Street  
 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002  
**Contact: Sandra Mays**  
 Phone: 307-777-7181  
 Fax: 307-777-7252

**American Samoa**

Malaetasi M. Togafau  
 Attorney General  
 Department of Legal Affairs  
 American Samoa Government  
 P.O. Box 7  
 Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799  
**Contact: Craig Keener**  
 Phone: 9-011-684-633-4163  
 Fax: 9-011-684-633-1838

**Commonwealth, Northern Mariana Islands**

Jack Ogumoro  
 Executive Director  
 Criminal Justice Planning Agency  
 Commonwealth of the Northern  
 Mariana Islands  
 Office of the Governor  
 Saipan, MP 96950  
**Contact: Jack Ogumoro**  
 Phone: 9-011-670-664-4550  
 Fax: 9-011-670-664-4560

**Guam**

Vincent P. Arriola  
 Director  
 Bureau of Planning  
 Governor's Office  
 P.O. Box 2950  
 Agana, Guam 96910  
**Contact: Miki Leon Guerrero**  
 Phone: 9-011-671-472-8931, ext. 405  
 Fax: 9-011-671-477-1812

For more information on the National Institute of Justice, please contact:

**National Criminal Justice Reference Service**

P.O. Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000  
800-851-3420  
e-mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.org

You can view or obtain an electronic version of this document from  
the NCJRS Bulletin Board System (BBS)  
or the NCJRS Justice Information Center World Wide Web site.

To access the BBS, direct dial through your computer modem:  
301-738-8895 (modems should be set at 9600 baud and 8-N-1),  
or Telnet to ncjrsbbs.aspensys.com or  
Gopher to ncjrs.org:71

To access the World Wide Web site, go to  
<http://www.ncjrs.org>

If you have any questions, call or e-mail NCJRS.

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*National Institute of Justice*

*Washington, D.C. 20531*

---

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
DOJ/NIJ  
Permit No. G-91